



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and we cannot doubt that it is so, — it is of importance that the true purposes and characteristics of the dramatic poem should be better known. When read with a right expectation, and measured by the just standard, it must come to be appreciated according to its merits. Then, the poems which we have named will ascend to their rightful place in the general estimation; then the two works of our own countryman Hillhouse, (“The Masque of Percy” and “Hadad”) will be called up from their hiding-places, and it will be acknowledged that they are among the high efforts of the age; the former, a model of the elegant, flowing, and expressive manner which combines a rich ornament with a perfect simplicity, and shows the power of the poet without sacrificing the probability of the scene; the latter, less easy and graceful, but of a stern and lofty power, and a mixture of the awful and the tender, well becoming its solemn and mysterious scenes. Then, too, the question will be asked, — nay, we ask it now, — Why are we not visited again by his classic muse?

Meantime, we indulge the hope, that both writers and readers will learn to refer themselves less to the stage and more to the real scenes of life, and that beautiful and holy delineations of character, conceived in the sacred meditations of exalted genius, will be set forth in such freedom from all conventional forms, as to save them from the pollution of the actual theatre. This will be equivalent to the introduction of a new class of literary composition; equally favorable, as far as we can see, for all that is most lofty and affecting in tragedy, while allowing greater liberty to the fancy of the author, and a wider range of illustration and verse.

---

ART. IV. — *A New and Copious Lexicon of the Latin Language; compiled chiefly from the “Magnum Totius Latinitatis Lexicon” of Facciolati and Forcellini, and the German Works of Scheller and Luenemann.* Edited by F. P. LEVERETT. Boston; J. H. Wilkins & R. B. Carter. 1836. 8vo. pp. 1004.

It may seem to some of our readers hardly credible, that at this late period a new Latin Dictionary was needed in the English language. Classical literature has been so long and

so much cultivated in the parent country, that the most natural conclusion, to one who has not attended to this subject, certainly is, that whatever can be necessary or convenient in teaching or learning the Latin language, must have been long since provided. But the truth is, — how this fact can be accounted for is not now the question, — that in this department of literature, there has been among the English a great and manifest deficiency. While several nations on the continent of Europe have had Latin lexicons highly improved, and affording most, if not all, the information to be expected from such sources, English scholars, to a great extent, have been obliged to avail themselves of foreign assistance; and where this was not possible, they have had nothing to rely on, in addition to the aid of instructors and their own observation in the course of their reading, but such help as could be derived from the Dictionary of Ainsworth.

The progress of Latin lexicography in modern Europe has not been rapid. The *Catholicon* of John of Genoa, the earliest printed work in this department, first appeared in 1460. It was published, as appears from its date, in the infancy of the typographical art; and is supposed on good authority to have proceeded from the press of Faust, who among the Germans is believed to have been the inventor of the art of printing. The name of Faust, however, does not appear in the volume. The author of this lexicon finished his work in 1286, and was probably aided in his labors by the use of the older vocabularies, particularly that of Papias, a Lombard, who flourished in the eleventh century, and also that of Ugo or Uguccio, an ecclesiastic of Pisa, and afterwards archbishop of Ferrara, who lived about a century later. The supposition of an earlier edition of the *Catholicon* than this of 1460, struck from carved blocks of wood, has not sufficient authority. This work was, without doubt, very imperfect, and appears to have been marked with no considerable erudition. The explanation of words relating to theology was somewhat better than that of others, as might be supposed from the profession of those employed in its composition. With all its defects, however, it was not wholly destitute of merit, and passed through several editions, both in Italy and France.

Omitting several names of less note, we would mention John Reuchlin or Capnio, a German, and Nicholas Perottus,

archbishop of Siponto, as numbered among those, who in the fifteenth century deserved well of Latin lexicography. But one of the most known of the early Latin dictionaries was that of Calepin. The author was a monk, and took his name from a small town called Calepio, in the territory of Venice as it then existed. Calepin made liberal use of the labors of his predecessors in the preparation of his work, but, as at first published in 1502, it was of no great value. Succeeding scholars corrected some of its errors, and supplied some of its defects, and numerous editions of this dictionary followed each other. Among those who labored to improve the lexicon of Calepin, are found the names of Joh. Passeratius, Jac. Montanus, Lud. de la Cerda, Conrad. Gesner, and Budæus.

In the early part of the sixteenth century, this department of Latin literature received a valuable addition in the well-known *Lexicon Ciceronianum* of Nizolius. This work, as improved by its successive editors, especially by Facciolati, exhibits in a form easily accessible the great body of Ciceronian Latinity, and, though substantially incorporated into later dictionaries, is still of great use to the student. It was less, however, the object of Nizolius to define the meaning of words, than to furnish forms of expression, and a general phraseological storehouse. But the claims of lexicography were not wholly disregarded. The author arranged the phrases, which he had collected, under distinct heads, though not always with a just discrimination; and this *Thesaurus* was an important accession to Latin literature, considered merely as a dictionary.

Robert Stephens, who was so highly distinguished both as a scholar and a printer, first published his *Thesaurus Lingue Latinæ* in 1531. This was a work of great labor and value. The author issued a second edition in 1536, and a third in 1543, with large improvements.

In the year 1571, was published at Leipsic the first edition of the *Thesaurus Lingue Scholasticæ* of Basil Faber. This author, in the composition of his work, departed in a great measure from the track of his predecessors. It was not his aim to furnish a vocabulary of the Latin language, with a bare explication of the meaning of words, but to enter more largely, than had hitherto been done, into the regions of poetry and criticism, and to exhibit in addition an extensive

view of idioms, peculiar constructions, and elegant phraseology. Hence his quotations from the Roman authors, both in prose and verse, are numerous and extended, and often selected with judgment and taste. Illustrations of mythology, geography, and history, constitute an important part of the work, and at the time of its appearance must have rendered it peculiarly valuable. The *Thesaurus* of Faber was improved by succeeding editors, and especially by Joh. Matt. Gesner, whose edition appeared at Leipsic in 1726.

Johannes de Garlandia, who flourished in the eleventh century, was the first Englishman who turned his attention to compiling a Latin dictionary, and his *Synonyma et Æquivoca* was first published at Cologne, in 1490, and soon after in London. About half a century after, Thomas Elyot published his *Bibliotheca*. Elyot was succeeded by numerous authors in the same department, among whom the most noted were Thomas Cowper, Francis and Thomas Holyoake, and Adam Littleton. This last-named lexicographer acquired the most reputation by his labors ; and his work, especially as improved in the Latin dictionary published at Cambridge in 1693, has very considerable value. The editors of this last work, among other aids, had at their disposal a manuscript collection of authorities from Roman authors, in three volumes, folio, by John Milton.

In the year 1735, a corrected and enlarged edition of the dictionary of Robert Stephens was published in London. In preparing this work for the press, the editors aimed to combine with the *Thesaurus* of Stephens some of the peculiar excellences of Faber. Their efforts were in a good degree successful ; and the publication of the London edition of Stephens brought this branch of lexicography to such a state, that, with the increased means of literary labor, and the new zeal which was manifest in every species of improvement, its subsequent more rapid advance towards perfection might be easily anticipated.

In the mean time, as the only Latin dictionary common in the English schools was that of Coles, which was full of errors and defects, proposals were made in 1714 to Mr. Robert Ainsworth, who enjoyed a high reputation for his knowledge of the Latin language, to prepare a new dictionary, which should better answer the public demand. This he undertook ; and after having labored, with some interruptions,

for more than twenty years, in 1736 he published his *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Compendarius*. The English-Latin Part was a great improvement on any thing of the kind which had preceded it. In the Second Part of the work, where the Latin precedes the English, the arrangement of the definitions was new. Each meaning was numbered, and the authorities, which were placed in a body after the English definitions, were numbered in the same manner for the ease of reference. This was thought an important improvement ; but it may be justly questioned, whether the use of this disposition of the authorities is not rather apparent than real. The eye, perhaps, may pass more readily from one part of a definition to another, so far as the English is concerned ; but if the authorities on which the definitions rest are to be consulted, a course almost always useful, and sometimes necessary to the student, there is an obvious source of embarrassment. And it will probably be found, likewise, that students, in consequence of this separation, often fail to consult the authorities as they ought, and to receive that advantage from them which they are designed to afford. This Dictionary of Ainsworth was very favorably received ; but with some excellences it had likewise its faults. Succeeding editors have somewhat improved it ; but on comparing in various places the late London stereotype edition with that of 1736, the changes appear to be few. Some errors have been corrected, and some deficiencies supplied, but the work is essentially what it was at first.

In the year 1715, a new Latin Lexicon was begun at Padua, chiefly at the suggestion, and under the superintendence and advice of Jac. Facciolati the head of the University. Facciolati was advantageously known by his labors in the promotion of Latin literature, particularly by his edition of the *Lexicon Ciceronianum* of Nizolius. He was likewise distinguished as one of the best writers in the Latin language among the moderns. To execute this work, he employed Egidio Forcellini, who had been his pupil, and who appears to have been every way qualified for the undertaking to which he was invited. At first the views of these scholars extended no further than to an enlarged edition of Calepin. This they finished in about four years ; but, in the course of the work, they had become so sensible of the inherent and irremediable faults of Calepin, that they determined to begin a Latin lexicon,

in some respects, on a new plan, and which should be independent of all that had preceded it, in the selection of words, in the definitions, and the arrangement of the senses. To the accomplishment of this great literary project Forcellini applied himself with uncommon assiduity, and in 1761 the *Lexicon* was completed. It was first published in 1771, several years after the death of the author. The names of Facciolati and Forcellini are united in this work, but it ought in justice to be stated, that the principal merit of its execution belongs to the latter. Facciolati himself says in reference to it, "Vix ego in plerasque voces quippiam contuli præter consilium, in multas autem ne consilium quidem."

The plan of this dictionary was digested with great care and judgment. The ancient authors in the Latin language were classed according to several chronological periods; as the purity of their style is found to correspond, in a great measure, to the age in which they flourished. The first period, extending from the time of the earliest Latin writers to the death of Augustus, and constituting the golden age of Latin literature, furnishes the great body of authorities on which the explication of words is grounded; later authors being referred to, in general, only as they in some way illustrate the earlier class, or afford some new meaning. In this way the rank of words and idioms as to their purity, and, for the most part, as to their propriety and elegance, is easily settled. To illustrate this portion of the work in part, reference may be made to the word *ala*, *a wing*. Here the combinations "movere alas," and "quater alas," are quoted from Virgil; but "explicare alas" is referred to Martial, and "expandere alas" to the elder Pliny. "Quater alas" is found likewise in Pliny; but Virgil is properly named as authority for this expression, as being an earlier writer.

It may be here remarked, that it ought by no means to be concluded, because phrases, idioms, or words occur in writers of a late date, that they were not current in the best age of the language. It is clearly possible, that many of them might have been, and without doubt some of them were, used in the lost works of Cicero, Sallust, Livy, and others of the same literary period. In a fragment of one of Cicero's orations, recovered by Mai, is the word *lenities*, which had before been placed in glossaries only. If the reading of this fragment is admitted to be genuine, *lenities* can no longer be

considered a word of suspicious or base origin ; and, from the manner in which it is employed, this word was manifestly in common and reputable use. In a fragment of Cicero's treatise "de Republicâ," first published by the same editor, is the word *convenicium*, which, at the time of the discovery of this fragment, had been long lost from the language. But the consideration stated above can have no influence on the composition of a dictionary, which must of necessity be constructed of materials actually existing.

The next important principle, settled by Forcellini in the composition of his *Lexicon*, respected the classification of meanings and their arrangement. This branch of the subject had been treated by preceding lexicographers with much less care than its importance demands. Very different meanings had often been confounded, and distinctions often introduced, where there was really no difference. The labors of the author here were attended with distinguished success. It would be perhaps too much to say, that he is never in error. The difficulties in the way of a clear and unobjectionable classification of meanings are in some cases nearly or quite insurmountable ; but that he improved greatly on all who preceded him, is undeniable. In the arrangement of the meanings, that is placed first, which from the use of a word among authors of the first class, appears to have been the earliest, and from which there is the most ready and easy transition to other meanings ; and these again are made to follow each other on the same principle. All parts of a definition, therefore, illustrate each other ; and, from a comparison of the whole, the real force and import of a word can hardly be mistaken.

As to the definitions, very little is made to depend on an accumulation of synonyms, a method which often obscures rather than elucidates a signification. Definitions are given for the most part in descriptive language, so precise and definite, that, with the subjoined examples, the reader is satisfied, that he has every thing before him necessary to a full understanding of the case in question. Robert Stephens, in the first edition of his *lexicon*, defined the words in the French language. In the second and third editions, the French was excluded, and Latin was introduced. One reason for this change was to procure for his work a more general currency. Forcellini has given first the corresponding Italian word, then the Greek, and, after these, the full definition in Latin. Care is



likewise taken, in the selection of authorities, that the different constructions of a word with others should be exhibited, so far as such constructions affect the sense.

The metaphorical senses are also distinguished from the literal. Names of the gods in ancient mythology, names of persons current in the history of the fabulous and heroic ages, and names of places, rivers, mountains, and whatever else relates to the same early period, are inserted with the proper references to the authors, from whom the information is derived. Besides the classes of words already mentioned, others of no authority, or for the most part barbarous, are thrown into an appendix. Such is the general plan of the Latin Lexicon of Facciolati and Forcellini, which hardly admits of improvement; and the execution in every part shows extensive learning, great accuracy, diligence, and sound judgment. That, in a work so extensive, every part should be executed with equal success, is not to be expected. The most, however, that succeeding editors have accomplished, is to supply a few omissions; and this lexicon deserves to be reckoned among the most perfect works of the kind, which have ever been composed.

While this dictionary of Forcellini was in progress, a new Latin lexicon was undertaken in Germany, by John Matth. Gesner. His scheme was, to make the London edition of Stephens the basis of his work. In making improvements in this, he professes to have removed many excrescences, to have corrected numerous errors, and to have made large additions. This lexicon was published in 1749, and was a most valuable contribution to lexicography. Not being an independent work, as the author chose to make few alterations in the plan of Stephens, it has less uniformity of execution, than the Lexicon of Forcellini. The different senses of a word are not always philosophically arranged; and authorities are sometimes furnished in disproportionate numbers. The definitions are in Latin, and generally clear and full. As a storehouse of the varieties of Latin phraseology, the Thesaurus of Gesner is of the highest value to the student of Latin literature.

A work was still wanting in this department, of a more popular character; and accordingly, in 1783, J. Im. G. Scheller published his copious German-Latin and Latin-German Lexicon, which, as a universal dictionary of the Latin language for the use of students generally, has some advantages over

Gesner. The arrangement of words is throughout alphabetical. In the *Thesaurus* of Gesner, the order of derivation is observed. The definitions are in the German language, and the authorities are selected with admirable judgment, both for confirming the significations assigned to the words, and illustrating the varieties of grammatical construction. Many of these passages are translated, especially where any difficulty can be supposed to exist. To the arrangement of the different meanings of words Scheller has paid unusual attention, and the whole work is digested throughout on a uniform plan. This *Lexicon* was received in Germany with great approbation. Two editions of it were published by the author; the third, which appeared in 1804, soon after the death of Scheller, had been revised by him. No stronger proof is needed of its excellence, than the fact, that for more than half a century, as a *Thesaurus*, it has not been superseded in Germany. An abridgment of it has long been used in schools, and a valuable manual Latin lexicon, chiefly derived from Scheller, has been published by Luenemann. An English translation of Scheller has been lately printed at Oxford; but, so far as we have had opportunity to examine it, we have not formed a high opinion of its merits.

In the year 1799, an edition of Scheller was published in Holland, which had been prepared under the direction of Rhunken. Scheller, in the same manner as Gesner and Forcellini, made his work a general lexicon of the language. The Leyden edition, by the advice of Rhunken, was limited to the proper classic authors, or such as have some reputation for purity in the choice of words. The reasons assigned for this course are not altogether satisfactory. Words used by authors of little note actually occur, and the student needs some explication of them. At least it may be useful to know on what authority such words rest; and, if the writer who has first used them is named and characterized, as is done by Forcellini, there is little danger, that a dictionary so constructed will give currency to barbarisms.

To furnish any further details of the progress of Latin lexicography on the continent of Europe, is unnecessary for our object, which is to bring distinctly into view the abundant means of improving our Latin-English dictionaries, which have been accumulating during the last century. The *Dictionary* of Ainsworth, as before stated, was published first in 1736. The author, therefore, could have received no assistance from the

materials collected by Gesner, Fortellini, Scheller, and others of a later date. Even the London edition of Robert Stephens was published in 1735, and could have been of no material use to Ainsworth. Indeed, this edition of Stephens is not mentioned in Ainsworth's Preface. That Ainsworth's Dictionary, therefore, should fail to satisfy the requirements of the present time, might be expected as a matter of course. Yet, strange as it may seem, Ainsworth's Dictionary is almost the only one found in our schools. The student first becomes acquainted with the abridgment, while learning the elements of the Latin language ; and, if he ever has the good fortune to attain to any thing better, it is too often only the same work in its original form.

A Latin Thesaurus was, indeed, prepared by Dr. Adam of Edinburgh, the author of the well-known Latin Grammar ; but owing, if we are correctly informed, to some difficulty in making arrangements for its publication, between the proprietors of the manuscript and the booksellers, it has never been put to press. An abridgment of this work was published by the author in 1805, varied in different parts so as to afford specimens of several dictionaries for different classes of scholars, which he was then preparing. In 1814, several years after the death of Dr. Adam, there appeared a second edition of this abridgment, prepared on a uniform plan. This dictionary was very useful to the student in reading the common school classics, but it was never very extensively circulated, and is now, it is believed, entirely out of print. Ainsworth's, therefore, being, in fact, the only work in this department, to which our students generally have had access, it may not be a useless undertaking to examine a little more particularly into its real character. From the facts above stated, we might infer without danger of mistake, that this lexicon would be found in many respects deficient ; yet an actual exhibition of what some of these deficiencies are, may be more satisfactory, and show more clearly the necessity of some new work, than any general conclusion from the time and circumstances in which the author wrote.

For this purpose we will take, not the original edition of 1736, but the last London stereotype edition ; as this is the one which the student is most likely to find in the shops, and the editor professes to have revised the whole. It is indispensable in the dictionary of any language, that it should

exhibit all the meanings of the words in that language, properly illustrated; that these meanings should be clearly distinct; and that they should be so arranged, where it can be done, as to demonstrate their mutual dependence. To see what Ainsworth's Dictionary is, in these several particulars, we will look at a few words under the letter D, not selected as differing from the rest of the work, but as affording a fair specimen of its general execution.

*Damno.* This word has five different meanings assigned to it by Ainsworth. The first is, *to condemn, to dislike*; and the authority for this signification is a passage from the *Pharsalia* of Lucan. "*Miles damnat causamque ducemque.*" The meaning of "*damnat*" here is, *greatly disapproves of, regards with strong aversion and displeasure.* This is obviously a figurative use of the word, and is, therefore, most injudiciously placed as its leading signification. That this is not the original, but a derived sense of the word, appears highly probable from the fact, that *damno*, signifying strong disapprobation or dislike, is not found in Cicero, and other writers of the same age; but, with this meaning, it first comes to our knowledge in Lucan, Quintilian, Pliny, and Statius. It is a metaphorical sense of the word, derived from its proper signification, *to condemn or sentence judicially*; that is, to pronounce one *subject to loss or damage, as a penalty.* This is its most common meaning in Cicero, and is plainly that from which all its other meanings are derived. The second meaning assigned to this word by Ainsworth is, *to devote to, or consign over*, a sense, which the word has, and which proceeded obviously from what we have stated to be its leading signification. But, placed as it is after a metaphorical meaning, it is left indistinct and obscure. The third sense of this word, according to Ainsworth, is, *to cast in a suit at law.* For this signification he quotes Tacitus as authority, though it is found in earlier writers, and is closely connected with what appears to be the original sense of the word, and should have been brought near it, that, in this way, its proper force might be easily apprehended. It deserves to be remarked here, that what Forcellini with obvious correctness assigns to this verb as its leading sense, is not even mentioned by Ainsworth. The nearest he approaches to it, is in the signification *to cast in a suit at law*, "*sub iudice damnare,*" that is, *to procure the condemnation of some one*; but *to condemn judicially* by

the direct action of the judge, is a meaning which he has not ascribed to *damno*. Other plain objections lie against the explication of this word, as it stands in Ainsworth. But we pass to

*Damnum*. The different significations of this word are very imperfectly exhibited. Its meaning as a *penalty*, and a *confiscation of property*, is not mentioned.

*Daps*. Ainsworth makes the leading signification of this word, *a feast upon a sacrifice*. Forcellini, with apparent reason, has given this order of its meanings, *food, a feast, a banquet, food offered to the gods, an offering, &c.*

*Decerno*. The first meaning of this word, according to Ainsworth, is *to discern by the eye*. *Cernere* with *oculis* expressed, or necessarily implied, signifies *to distinguish clearly by the sight*, though Ainsworth has not marked this use of the word. That *decernere* in its proper sense, has any reference to the eye, does not appear from the example which Ainsworth has adduced. His authority is from a fragment of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus. "*Qui nequeas nostrorum uter sit Amphitruo decernere.*" But, "*decernere*" means here not to distinguish by the sight only, but to determine in any way. This appears clearly by reference to the circumstances of Jupiter and *Amphitruo* in the play, to whom this language applies; and this is the explanation given of the passage by Forcellini.

*Decerto*. To this word Ainsworth has assigned two meanings. 1st, *to contend, to strive, to dispute*, and, 2d, *to try it out by words or blows*. Here there appears to be a distinction without a difference. For the second meaning the authority of Statius is quoted. "*Agmina bello decertare putes.*" To say nothing here of the impropriety of selecting Statius, when examples in point in earlier writers are so numerous, the passage cited may answer to show the use of the word where *blows* are concerned, but fails as to *words*. If the connexion of "*bello*" with "*decertare*" is a sufficient reason for ascribing a new meaning to the word, then several other significations should have been added, on account of adjuncts, which are now passed over in silence.

*Decido*. The first meaning of this verb in its active sense, according to Ainsworth, is, *to cut out*; and his proof is a passage of Plautus, "*Decide mihi collum.*" But Forcellini remarks more correctly of this verb, "*De iis fere dicitur,*

quæ si abscindantur deorsum cadunt." The meaning is, *to cut from, or off*. This is clear from the passage in Plautus, to which reference is made.

"Decide collum, si falsum 'st, uti loquor;  
Vel, ut scias me amare, cape cultrum, seca  
Digitum vel aurem, vel tu nasum vel labrum;" etc.

The interchange of the verb "*seco*" with "*decido*" makes the meaning clear. The second meaning of this verb, in Ainsworth, is, *to determine, to conclude*; and the third meaning, *to decide a business*, without any apparent distinction, and the authorities adduced show that there is none.

We find very frequently in Ainsworth, a difference of meaning assigned to a word, where the only distinction is, that the word is found in some new connexion, but expressing the same general ideas. Thus,

*Defugio*. The first sense given to this verb is *to shun, or avoid*, and the second, *to refuse to accept of*. But, "*aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt*," which is quoted from Cæsar, as an example of the first use, and "*administrationem reipublicæ defugere*," from the same author, as an example of the second, show no variation in the signification of the verb; there is simply a variation in the adjunct. Or, if it should be maintained that there is ground here for a distinction, this verb, on the same principle, should have still a new sense in the phrase "*contentiones defugere*" of Cicero, and still another in the "*assentationem defugere*" of Pliny. But all these uses of the word are very properly brought under the same division by Forcellini. The fault now remarked upon is so common in Ainsworth, that to point out more instances of it seems unnecessary. It may be seen on every page, and in the explanation of almost every word, where there is any considerable detail.

Another very great defect in Ainsworth's Dictionary is, that very little information is afforded by it, of the mode in which any one word is connected with others to express various relations. This fault is radical, as will be at once discovered by every student, who shall endeavour to ascertain from this work the extent to which words are combined, to express the same or a different idea. Nor is this of importance alone, as respects settling points of Latinity, but often as to the meaning of a writer. This deficiency in Ainsworth, to which

allusion is now made, may be seen in all parts of the work. Thus, to recur to some of the words already brought under review. Under "damno," the student will find no example of the construction of this word with others, to show the cause for which any one is condemned. But in Forcellini he will see, that Cicero, among other modes of expression, has "damnare aliquem sceleris," "quempiam aliquo crimine," "damnari nomine sceleris," "de pecuniis repetundis," and that Ovid uses the phrase "damnare in aliquâ re," and Suetonius, "ob aliquam rem." As to the manner of expressing the punishment to which any one is condemned, nothing can be learned from Ainsworth, except that the dative case is used. But it is equally important to know, that there is authority for saying, "damnare ad opus," *to condemn to hard labor*; "damnare ad metallum," *to condemn to the mines*, &c. These are some of the deficiencies alluded to, which occur under the word "damno."

*Decerto.* From what Ainsworth has furnished to illustrate the construction of this word, all that could be inferred is, that the phrase "inter se decertare," corresponds to the English, *to contend among themselves*, and "bello decertare," *to contend in war*. But the student wishes to know, how the place of contention is connected with the verb, and will find in Forcellini the combination, "in suis finibus decertare." He will likewise see, that to contend *against*, is "decertare contra vim"; to contend *for* or *concerning*, is, "decertare de imperio"; to contend *with*, that is, *against* some one, "decertare cum aliquo," "cum duobus ducibus"; and that to contend with an instrument is exemplified by "armis decertare." Deficiencies of this kind may be found in Ainsworth, by opening the book anywhere at random. For example,

*Introitus.* Here, "introitus portûs," *the entrance of the harbour*, and "introitus defensionis," *the entrance on the defence*, illustrate the connexion of this word with others in the genitive case; but the forms, "introitus Smyrnam," "introitus in urbem," equally necessary to be known, are not noticed.

*Invictus.* Here may be found "invictus a labore," and "corpus ad vulnera invictum," but not "crocodilus contra omnes ictus invicta," quite as important as either of the others.

But a not less radical defect of Ainsworth, as a guide to  
VOL. XLV. — NO. 97.

Latinity, is the partial exhibition, which it affords, of the extent to which words are used in connexion with others. We have been speaking of the manner in which words are united in construction; the inquiry now is, in what company words should be found. Here languages greatly vary. The analogies followed in different forms of speech are so diverse, that to infer from one to another, in deciding questions of propriety of expression, is always hazardous, and will generally lead into error. The most ludicrous mistakes in the use of a foreign language, arise from this source. In Latin, "conscendere equum," or, "in equum," is *to mount a horse*; but we find likewise "conscendere æthera," "conscendere montem," and "in montem," "conscendere vitis ramos," "conscendere tribunal," "conscendere navem" and "in navem," "conscendere æquor," &c. Now there is no verb in the English language, which can with propriety be employed in translating all the preceding phrases. In each case, we have the means of a sufficiently exact version, but must make several changes of the verb, as in the English combinations different analogies have been followed from those in the Latin. This is a part of every language not vernacular to the student, very difficult to be made familiar. The student is perpetually liable to be drawn away by the application of some word in his own language, which is entirely discordant with the usage of the language which he is learning. Among the means of overcoming this difficulty, there is none more effectual; than a full and correct dictionary. To this there should be a constant reference; the various connexions of words should be traced, the extent of their applications ascertained; and frequent and careful reading will familiarize the whole.

That the Dictionary of Ainsworth is entirely inadequate as a guide to the student in this part of the Latin language, will be manifest on a slight examination. If we recur to the word "conscendere," in Ainsworth, several of the uses above noted will not be found. He has not inserted "conscendere æthera," "vitis ramos," or "æquor," neither of which could be shown with certainty to be correct, from any analogy furnished by the phrases actually quoted. The same deficiency will be found on every page of the work. Thus, to look at one more word,

*Dejicere.* The following are important applications of this



verb, which are omitted by Ainsworth. "*Dejicere se per munitiones*" (Cic.), *to rush violently through, &c.* "*Præsidium Claternâ dejecit Hirtius*" (Cæs.), *dislodged, drove out a garrison.* It is applied likewise to *ships driven by the wind*, "*naves ad inferiorem partem insulæ dejicerentur*" (Cæs.); to the *casting of lots*, "*dejicere sortes*" (Cæs.); to *riding rapidly* from higher to lower ground, "*dicto prope citius equum in viam Claudius dejecit*" (Liv.); to *sacrificing* of victims, "*Thetidi juvencam dejecit*" (Val. Max.); to *killing*, "*Catillus Iolam dejecit*" (Virg.); to *turning aside* the eyes, "*pueri oculos de isto nunquam dejicere*" (Cic.); to *warding off*, "*verbera depulsurum, cruciatumque a corpore dejecturum arbitrabatur*" (Cic.); to *prevailing upon one to give up* an opinion, "*aliquem de sententiâ dejicere*" (Cic.). It is unnecessary to add more instances here, as it must be plain, that Ainsworth has failed to give even a tolerable view of the use and meaning of this word.

If the reader should wish to examine Ainsworth further in this part of his work, let him look at the verb *delabor*, and see whether any thing there adduced sufficiently authorizes "*flumen delabens Etruscum in mare*" (Hor.); "*delabi in insidias*" (Aur. Vict.); "*delabi in morbum*" (Cic.); "*delabi in suspiciones*" (Cic.); "*delabi in sermonem*" (Cic.); "*delabi ad æquitatem*" (Cic.), &c. He can look likewise at the verb *deleo*, and apply any thing which he shall find, to such phrases as these, "*delere omnem improbitatem*" (Cic.); "*delere religionem*" (Cic.); "*deleat omne bellum*" (Cor. Nep.); and at the verb *depello*, and at these examples of its use, "*famem sitimque depellere*" (Cic.); "*nubila cœlo depellere*" (Tibull.); "*depellere servitutem a civibus*" (Cic.); "*magnâ spe depellere*" (Liv.); "*depelli sententiâ*" (Cic.), and many others.

This want in Ainsworth of a full exhibition of the actual use of words in connexion with others, deserves particularly to be noticed in cases, where a word has been transferred to our own language with little variation. In all such instances, the student, by following the analogies of his own language, is peculiarly exposed to mistakes. Examples of this kind are very frequent. "*Terras devorant aquæ*" (Plin.). For "*devorant*," we might use in English, *ingulf*, or *swallow up*, but hardly *devour*; yet Latin use sanctions "*devorant*." The same author says, "*terra devoravit Cybotum, altissimum montem, cum oppido Curite*." Here, again, English usage would

condemn the word *devour*, and the student needs to see an example of this kind, to assure him that it is authorized in Latin. The verb “impingere” has numerous acceptations which our English word *impinge* has not, many of which are not noticed by Ainsworth. Plautus says, “pugnum in os impingere,” “impingere alicui beneficium,” “impingere suavium alicui.” Our word *inculcate*, is a poor index to the uses of the Latin “incolco.” Among other important omissions by Ainsworth, is the use of this word by Cicero, “verba Græca inculcantes.” The Latin verb “infligere,” also, has uses not analogous to *inflict* in English, which are not mentioned by Ainsworth, as “navis inflicta vadis” (Virg.); “usuras infligere” (Pandect.). The same defect is in all parts of the volume.

In all languages, many words have what is called an absolute sense. A word, from being often connected with another, when the discourse is about a particular subject, comes finally to convey the idea intended alone; or the word at first associated with it is so easily understood, that it is omitted without inconvenience. We say of a man, who has failed to pay his debts, or to continue his mercantile business for want of means, that he has *failed*. This word is said to be used in an absolute sense. A dictionary of a foreign language, which does not furnish a full list of such words,—and they are numerous in all forms of speech,—is deficient in an essential point. There are numerous cases of this use of words in the Latin language, which are not noted in Ainsworth’s Dictionary. Thus, that “descendere equo” means to *dismount*, we learn from Ainsworth; but we are not told, that “descendere” is used in the same sense, absolutely, that is, without “equo.” “Despondere” with “animum,” signifies to *lose heart* or *courage*, to *despair*; it is used likewise in the same sense absolutely. Cornelius Nepos employs the expressions “detrabere de famâ alicujus,” “de gloriâ cujuspian”; he says likewise “multum ei detraxit, quod alienæ erat civitatis,” where “detraxit” is used in the absolute form. Cæsar uses this language, “ad littora cursum dirigere,” to *direct the course to the shore*. Seneca says, “ad Nesida direxi,” where the verb is used absolutely; “cursum” or “navem” being omitted. We say likewise in English, he *steered* for some port.

Another fault in Ainsworth is, that he has failed, in many

instances, to distinguish properly the metaphorical sense of words. Thus, "in singulos severitas imperatoris destringitur." (Sen.) "Non ego mordaci destrinxi carmine quenquam." (Ov.) The verb "destringere" is used in these instances, figuratively, but is not so marked by Ainsworth. We read in Cicero, "sunt alii plures, fortasse; sed memoriâ meâ dilabuntur." The verb here is not distinguished by Ainsworth, as used in a figurative sense. We find in Nepos, "a fortunâ datam occasionem liberandæ Græciæ dimittere." The metaphorical sense of "dimittere," Ainsworth has not marked. We read in Virgil, "disjice compositam pacem, sere crimina belli," and in Livy, "hæc consilia ducis disjecit"; but here again Ainsworth has failed to distinguish the figurative use of the verb. We might proceed in this way through the volume. It may, indeed, be said, that the departure from the literal sense of the verbs, in the passages above cited, is so easily seen, that to mark it would have been superfluous, and that this whole subject may be properly left to him who consults the dictionary. But difficulties in the signification of words often depend on slight transitions of the sense, and in no case more frequently, than where there is a departure from the literal sense of a word to that which is metaphorical. Hence the necessity, that the metaphorical use of words should be noted.

The Dictionary of Ainsworth is likewise very imperfect, as an exhibition of the grammatical structure of the Latin language. A grammar of any language, especially such as are in the hands of most students, is necessarily limited to general principles, or brief details. It is in the lexicon, that we expect to find unfolded the actual construction of each word, as well in its ordinary use, as in its anomalies. This is more particularly to be expected in a language no longer spoken, and which, like the Latin, is contained in a well-known body of authors. The facts can here be ascertained, and it is in the dictionary that they should be fully exhibited. Ainsworth, compared in this respect with either of the principal Latin lexicographers since his time, particularly with Forcellini and Scheller, will be found extremely imperfect. A reference to a few particulars will establish this point.

Whether words admit "ut," "quod," "quominus," or the accusative with the infinitive after them, the student can hardly recollect, in every instance, from his own reading;

his grammar will not satisfy him in all cases ; and it is to his dictionary, that he should be able to apply with confidence for the necessary information. For an example, we will turn to the verb “*objicio*.” The proper construction of other verbs after this, is determined at once by reference to Forcellini. Cicero says to Verres, “*non tibi objicio quod hominem omni argento spoliasti*,” and in a letter to Atticus, “*surgit pulchellus puer ; objicit mihi, me ad Baias fuisse*.” There are no examples like these in Ainsworth. That the accusative and infinitive is a proper construction after “*opinio*,” may be seen in Ainsworth ; that “*ut*” and the subjunctive, is likewise used, the student must look for proof in some other place. We find in Livy, “*parum est quod veterrimas provincias meas, Siciliam et Sardiniam, adimis*,” and, in Pliny, “*parum est, ut in curiam venias, nisi et convocas*.” There are no such examples in Ainsworth, to illustrate the use of “*parum*.” “*Prohibeo*” is followed by “*ne*,” “*quominus*,” “*quin*,” and by the accusative and infinitive, but in Ainsworth there are no authorities. “*Propono*” is followed by “*ut*” and the subjunctive, and by the accusative and infinitive, but this does not appear in Ainsworth. It should be added here, that Forcellini seems not to have aimed at perfection in this part of his work. Occasional omissions may be found, which succeeding editors have not supplied.

Another part of Latin construction, which Ainsworth has failed to illustrate sufficiently, is the admission of the infinitive after verbs and some other words. The grammars, at least most of them, do not furnish in all cases the requisite information ; and the resource of the student should be his dictionary. Thus, whether “*imbibo*” admits an infinitive after it, cannot be determined from Ainsworth. In Forcellini, we have the following quotation from Cæsar. “*Quod si facere noluerit, atque imbiberit ejusmodi rationibus illum ad suas conditiones perducere*.” The infinitive also follows “*dignor*,” both in prose writers and poets, but it does not appear from Ainsworth. This defect pervades the whole work.

Ainsworth’s Dictionary also is very unsatisfactory in the account which it contains of the particles. Forcellini, though very full in this part of his work, is less complete than the student will sometimes desire ; to the English edition, therefore, of this dictionary, the valuable treatise of Tursellin has been properly added.

But the editor of the stereotype edition of Ainsworth says ; "It is in the table of proper names, that our improvements have been most numerous and important." He points out various errors in this table, as at first composed, and speaks of the "unremitting vigilance, that will be found to have been exerted," in reviewing this part of the work.

Some reference to this table, therefore, in its improved state, will afford a fair criterion of the value of this editor's labors. He professes to have struck out much, which in the original edition was superfluous and unnecessary. "We saw no reason," he says, "why our index should include a register of Actæon's hounds, or Pluto's horses ; of the victims of the epic heroes, or of the nymphs in the train of Cyrene." The obvious conclusion from this statement is, that the names here referred to are erased. Yet of Actæon's hounds, the names of eight or nine are retained ; and it does not at once appear, why the rest of the pack are excluded. A part, as Melampus, *Blackfoot* ; Leucon, *White* ; Aello, *Tempest*, have been expunged ; while others, as Dorceus, *Quicksight* ; Oribasus, *Ranger* ; Asbolus, *Blackshag*, are allowed to retain their places, without any reason assigned for this distinction. Pluto's horses, Orphnæus, Æthon, Nycteus, and Alastor, hold their places in the last edition as in the first. Cyrene's attendant nymphs have not disappeared, nor have Diana's been removed from their former station, against whose right, however, to be enrolled in this vocabulary, the editor does not object ; though a rule, which would exclude the retinue of one of these goddesses, should seem to bear equally hard on that of the other.

As to the victims of the epic heroes, Theron, we are told, in the last as in the first edition, "was a stout Latin slain by Æneas." Alcanor, who was engaged in the same contest in which Theron was killed, and had the honor of being wounded by Æneas, is inserted in the register ; but all the information given respecting him, is in these words ; "a man's name." "Telon," we are told, was "the son of Æbalus," and Virgil is quoted as authority for the fact ; but Virgil says, that Æbalus was the son of Telon, and this is the statement in the edition of 1736. Of Æbalus we find nothing, though a more important personage than his father ; and a king of Sparta of the same name is passed over, who, as being the grandfather of Castor, Pollux, Clytemnestra, and Helen, might

seem to have some claim to notice. It is manifest, that this part of the dictionary was at first prepared on no uniform principle, and with little care, and that it has been since, in a small degree, if at all, improved.

The biographical and historical part of this index, we are given to understand, has received important improvements ; yet errors in the account of so well known an individual as Cicero have remained undisturbed from 1736 to the present time. Of Cicero it is said, that “his first action in public life, was his defence of Sex. Roscius against a prosecution conducted by one of Sylla’s creatures.” If by “action in public life,” is meant his appearance as an advocate, his defence of Sex. Roscius cannot be considered the first. Before this, he defended Publius Quintius, and not improbably was engaged in other civil suits. It is added, “the freedom of his remarks was so displeasing to the dictator, that he was obliged to leave Rome, and travel into the provinces of Greece and Asia.” But Cicero continued in Rome a year after his defence of Roscius, and took part in another cause, not less displeasing to the dictator. It is said, likewise, that Cicero, on his return from Asia, where he had studied at Rhodes, under Molon, “was made ædile, and in that office impeached Verres for misgovernment in Sicily.” It would seem to be intimated here, that Cicero undertook this impeachment in the character of ædile ; whereas the business of an ædile had no connexion whatever with such a prosecution as this against Verres. But the fact was, that Cicero, when he impeached Verres, was not ædile. He had been elected to that office, but did not enter on its duties till the business of the prosecution was completed.

Attempts to correct mistakes in the original edition are not always successful. Thus in the edition of 1736, Dio Cassius is said to have been “a Greek historian, *cujus opera hodie extant*.” In the last edition it stands, “a Greek historian, who wrote a Roman history from the *foundation* in *eight* books, of which the beginning and end are lost.” The question might be raised here,—Which account is the most erroneous ?

The editor says, “we would particularly solicit the reader to glance at the articles Claudius, Fabius, or Metellus.” If the reader will do this, he will find no mention of Appius Claudius Regillensis, the founder of the Claudian family, nor

of his two sons, all of whom make a distinguished figure in the Roman annals. Appius Claudius, the decemvir, is said "to have died under impeachment." A more exact statement would have been, that he killed himself. Of more than seventy Fabii, who are celebrated in Roman story, nine only are mentioned; and there are no obvious reasons, why some are admitted, and others excluded. The first of the name of Metellus mentioned in this index, is L. Cæcilius Metellus, who was frightened by Scipio Africanus from his design of quitting Italy after the battle of Cannæ. But no mention is made of another L. Cæcilius Metellus, who gained a great victory over the Carthaginians in Sicily, was honored with a splendid triumph, and who received afterwards an uncommon mark of public favor, for his zeal and intrepidity in saving the Palladium from the conflagration of the temple of Vesta.

These are specimens of the errors in this part of Ainsworth's Dictionary, from which an opinion can be formed of the little care bestowed on its original compilation, and the slight attention with which it has been revised in the successive editions. Its faults, indeed, are so numerous, that the student can place little or no reliance on its statements. Whoever makes it his sole dependence in the mythology and history which it comprises, is constantly liable to be led into great, and often very ludicrous mistakes. But, notwithstanding the imperfection of this dictionary in every part of it, its comparative value, at the time of its first appearance, was by no means small; and, considering the state of lexicography at that period, there is no reason to wonder, that its use was widely extended.

It is now, however, in a good measure obsolete; and a Latin dictionary founded on more recent investigations and improvements has been a long time greatly needed; such an one, as from its size and price could be placed within the reach of common students. As nothing of this kind had been attempted, which at all answered the public necessities, the work which is named at the head of this article was projected. It was the design of the editor to prepare a Latin Lexicon of moderate extent, which should combine, as far as possible, the peculiar excellences of Forcellini, Scheller, and Luenemann.

The limits of this work of Mr. Leverett necessarily exclude numerous authorities, which are cited in the larger dictionaries, and those which are retained are given in an abridged form;

yet by a judicious selection and cautious reduction, the passages furnished from the Latin classics clearly establish, in most instances, if not all, the several meanings assigned to the words. For more full exhibitions of different forms of expression and construction, the student, from the necessity of the case, must recur to the original works. But such recurrence will ordinarily be had only by the more advanced scholar. The common reading of the Roman writers will rarely require it. When the larger lexicons are consulted, this advantage will be found from the previous use of the work under review, that it has led into no important error. The student, as he proceeds beyond this compilation, will find that he has begun the Latin language on a correct plan, and that he has nothing to unlearn. The only or principal change, in the use of additional means, will be perceived in the more minute survey which he can take of the ground occupied.

For more full satisfaction, as to the general character of this lexicon of Mr. Leverett, the reader can consult it under the several words to which reference is made in our remarks on Ainsworth. What he will find in these cases, may be safely put down as true of the work at large. There is one part only of the work, of which we would express a more qualified approbation. The editor remarks, that "in the arrangement of the meanings of words, Scheller and Luenemann have generally been more closely followed than Forcellini. They possess a manifest advantage, in a work of this kind and size, in bringing the phrases and idioms, which are given under a word, each into the place which its signification points out, and in incorporating the participles with the verbs to which they belong." — That there are advantages in this course, in some respects, is not denied; but in a few instances of the "arrangement of the meanings," we should have preferred Forcellini as a model. Two examples will show what we intend, and whether there is any foundation for the opinion now expressed. The leading meaning of *causa* according to Forcellini, is, *that which produces an effect*. According to Scheller, it is a *lawsuit*, a *judicial process*, and in this arrangement he is followed by Leverett. Now to us it appears much more probable, that *causa*, from signifying *that from which any thing proceeds*, came to denote the *ground* or *reason* of a controversy, and hence was employed to indicate the controversy itself, that is, a *litigation*, than that the contrary process took place.



Forcellini assigns to *mos*, as its first meaning, *custom*, *usage*, *manner*, and hence figuratively, one's *humor* or *will*. Scheller, and in this he is followed by Leverett, makes *the will*, *one's humor*, the leading signification of this word, and derives the sense, *manner*, *custom*, *usage*, from this ; which seems very much like assigning *humor*, as its original meaning, to the word *way*, because in reference to some peculiarities of disposition in an individual, we often use the language, "it is his or her *way*." But all this is left to the judgment of the reader. These errors, if they be such, are few in number, and are not likely to lead to any practical mistake.

As respects ancient geography, mythology, and names connected with the fabulous and heroic ages, the lexicon under review agrees generally, if not always, with Forcellini. The most important theological words introduced into the Latin language by the spread of Christianity through the Roman empire, especially such words of this class as are found in the writings of Tertullian, Arnobius, and some of the early Christian poets, are inserted in this dictionary. A few theological words occur in Ainsworth, which are not in Forcellini.

From a pretty full examination, therefore, of this work, we have no hesitation in congratulating the public on its appearance. One of the most considerable obstacles to an improved course of instruction in the Latin language, in this country, is removed ; and if the beneficial effects of this lexicon are not soon visible, the cause must be sought, not in the work itself, but in the imperfect and faulty use which is made of it. Heretofore, when attempts have been made to conduct the student to a more thorough knowledge of words in this language, and especially of idioms and construction, reference was made to works to which he had no ready access ; and discouragement, or at least a slow and unsatisfactory progress, was the consequence. Something far better in this department of study may now be reasonably anticipated.

Few laborers in the field of literature are more deserving of encouragement and commendation than lexicographers. Nor is their occupation, as sometimes represented, one of mere drudgery. The labor, indeed, of preparing a good dictionary in any language, is great, but it is a labor combined with numerous sources of mental gratification. It should ever be remembered, that Milton, while suffering the evils of blindness, cheered his solitude by collecting materials for a Latin diction-

ary ; and the three folio volumes of authorities, to which we have before alluded, are records of the recreations and pastime of a mind, occupied in the splendid creations of "*Paradise Lost*."

We cannot close this article without paying a tribute of respect to the character of the late Mr. Leverett. By his lamented death, his friends and the public have sustained no common calamity. His eminent abilities as a teacher, and his attainments in classical scholarship, were well known and highly appreciated in this community. His learning was profound and accurate, his taste was correct and severe. He was indefatigable in labor, zealous in acquiring and skilful in communicating knowledge, and scrupulously exact in enforcing discipline. Whilst at the head of the Boston Latin School, he more than sustained the already high reputation of that noble institution ; and when, a few years before his death, he withdrew from that honorable station to establish a private classical school, he was followed by public confidence and favor, and his school rose at once to the highest rank in popular esteem. To the exhausting labor of instruction, he added the gigantic task of preparing his dictionary ; a task which he had just completed, when, in the prime of life, and in the vigor of his powers, he was struck down by the hand of death. Mr. Leverett's high intellectual endowments, and uncommon purity of moral character, were graced by the charm of singularly modest and unassuming manners, which had won for him the cordial attachment of a large circle of literary friends. His private virtues they alone can fully estimate ; but of his learning and capacity for labor, "*exegit monumentum ære perennius*."

---